

### REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-16, and 18-21 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 4, 17, and 22-54 have been cancelled. The below comments present in greater detail distinctive features of applicants' claimed invention over the cited art that were conveyed to the Examiner over the telephone on August 24, 2007. Applicants' representative also thanks the Examiner for the teleconference of August 27, 2007 wherein the merits of subject claims over cited references were discussed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

#### **I. Rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Newell *et al.* (2003/0219226) and Moore *et al.* (2004/0230599). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested since Newell *et al.* and Moore *et al.* fail to teach or suggest all aspects of subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art and not based on the applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (emphasis added).

Applicants' claimed invention relates to systems and methods providing rich previews of documents, projects, and other digitally stored items *via* automated decomposition of such items in the form of graphical representations that are rendered by an associated user interface. To this

end, independent claim 1 recites *a decomposition component that automatically segregates at least one information item into a collection of subcomponents relating to the item by analyzing properties of the item including at least one of a type of the item, an item structure and an item content and the interface component includes a preview display enabling users to inspect sets of items, such as text applications, projects, tasks, presentation or graphics applications, and email documents and provides interactive representations allowing users to inspect, probe, or navigate among the subcomponents of the items at a focus of attention before launching a full application; and the interface component and the decomposition component are coupled with an offline or real-time analysis using principles of continual computation, and provide caching of rendered results so as to minimize latencies in real time.*

. Newell *et al.* and Moore *et al.* neither teach nor suggest such novel aspects.

Newell *et al.* provides methods and system for accessing video data stored on a storage device. A processor is used to generate a preview sequence comprising video sequences extracted from each video programme in the storage device. The preview sequence contains a plurality of video sequence and other textual or graphical data related to the programmes displayed. The Examiner concedes that Newell *et al.* does not teach all limitations recited in the subject independent claims, and attempts to cure the deficiencies of Newell *et al.* with Moore *et al.* However, Moore *et al.* merely relates to a file system shell which provides virtual folders to expose regular files and folders to users in different views based on their metadata instead of the actual physical underlying file system structure on the disk. Filters are provided for further narrowing down set of items; and this reference does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Newell *et al.*

At page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner incorrectly asserts that Newell *et al.* substantially teaches a decomposition component that automatically segregates at least one information item into a collection of subcomponents relating to the item *by analyzing properties of the item including at least one of a type of the item, an item structure and an item content.* The cited portion of the reference provides for accessing video data stored on a hard disk storage device. A processor is used to generate a preview sequence comprising video sequences extracted from each video programme in the storage device. The preview sequence can be provided as a grid containing a plurality of video sequences and other textual or graphical data related to the programmes displayed and further can be provided as a sequence of video

sequence (Paragraph 9). Video sequences in the grid can have a number of different arrangements depending upon the preference of the user. Fig. 1a shows a four by four grid arrangement of 16 video sequences and Fig. 1b shows eight video sequences arrangement leaving space for descriptive text to accompany each video sequence (Paragraph 19). The grid of video sequence can be rectangular and further can be distorted. Shape of video sequences in the grid (rectangular or any other shape) is decided by metadata and user preferences. Metadata is supplementary to the main data, that is being transmitted and acts as a means for describing the main data (Paragraph 29). Hence Newell *et al.* provides for generating a preview of video sequences in the form of a grid and the grid of video sequence having a number of arrangements and further shape of the grid of video sequences to be rectangular or other desired shape being decided by metadata and user preferences. The reference (Newell *et al.*) is limited only to preview of video sequences only in a number of arrangements and nowhere teaches or suggests *analyzing properties of the item including at least one of a type of the item, an item structure and an item content* let alone providing for previewing sequences of *text applications, projects, tasks, presentation or graphics applications, and email documents*. The invention facilitates users to inspect, probe, and navigate among document subcomponents of items at focus of attention, before “launching” a full application. For digital items, the structure of the preview hinges on an analysis of the nature of the type of items at focus of attention (*e.g.*, is this a Powerpoint file, a Word document, a set of interrelated emails, a set of pictures, *etc.*). The structure of the document (*e.g.*, number and sequence of pages, figures appear on a subset of pages, interrelated emails, sequence of images taken over time, *etc.*), details about the content of the items and metadata capturing such information as the when and how often different components were created, modified, or accessed.

At page 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner again incorrectly asserts that Moore *et al.* substantially teaches that *the interface component includes a preview display enabling users to inspect sets of items, such as text applications, projects, tasks, presentation or graphics applications and email documents*. The cited portion of the reference (Moore *et al.*) provides for virtual folders to expose regular files and folders to users in different views based on their metadata instead of the actual physical underlying file system. Virtual folder system includes a folder processor, a relational database, folder’s handler’s component, and a shell browser and a view component. The folder processor includes a native handling component, a handler factory

component, and a query builder's component. For the native handling code component and the folders handlers component, like all namespaces, virtual folders have to provide a set of certain handlers (context menu, icon, thumbnail, info tip) for their items. For most of these (info tip, data object, drag-drop handler, a background context menu), the virtual folder provides a common handler for all the type it holds. Author of the type has to be provided for some handlers like context menu on the item itself, writable property store (*See* paragraph 140). The reference (Moore *et al.*) further provides for stacking files by category. There are different stacks for a "XYZ corp." and its "marketing reports categories" (Paragraph 176). The screen display provided by the reference also includes quick link elements, filter elements, activity elements, information elements, control elements and virtual folder stacks. Quick link elements include an "all categories", "all authors", and a "January word" link. Quick links are selected by the user to perform desired navigations of the virtual folders. The filter elements filter down virtual folder or items depending upon the filter like "by date", "pick an author" desired by the user (Paragraph 164-166). Hence, Moore *et al.* merely provides for virtual folders which include quick link elements and filter elements for easily navigating through contents stored on the computer based on their metadata instead of the actual physical underlying file system. Virtual folders provide location independent and meta-data based view system and for *generating these virtual folders users need to submit a query to folder processor and then manipulate these virtual folders in order to get detailed view of the contents*. However Moore *et al.* nowhere teaches or suggests *a preview display on the user interface itself, without generating and arranging existing files in new order and further manipulating them in order to enable users to inspect sets of items such as text applications, projects, tasks, presentation or graphics applications, and email documents*. The present invention provides preview display which facilitates inspecting among components of an item and taking users well beyond simple initial pages or other types of thumbnails and providing rapid viewing of information. Data, files, documents and so forth can be represented *via* 2 or 3-dimensional icons or display objects wherein a z-axis of the icon corresponds to parameter of the item represented by the icon. As a user moves a cursor along the z-axis of the icon (or other axis), a preview pane displays for example pages corresponding with the particular point(s) on the axis. A user can thus quickly review a document and locate a specific point in the item of interest. By selecting the point, the item is opened at that location of interest.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Newell *et al.* and Moore *et al.* fail to teach or suggest all aspects of the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection of independent claim 1 (and the claims that depend there from) should be withdrawn.

**II. Rejection of Claims 18-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Newell *et al.* (2003/0219226) and Moore *et al.* (2004/0230599) and Card, et al. (2005/0005246).

Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Newell *et al.*, Moore *et al.* and Card *et al.* either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all features of the subject claims. In particular, Card *et al.* merely relates to displaying images of a virtual three-dimensional book having one or more virtual page and does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Newell *et al.*, Moore *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1 (which claims 18-20 depend from). In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Newell *et al.*, Moore *et al.* and Card *et al.* fail to teach or suggest all aspects of the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection of dependent claims 18-20 should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP461US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731